arXiv:1403.6772v1 [hep-ph] 26 Mar 2014

UCRHEP-T542
March 2014

Scotogenic Z_2 or $U(1)_D$ Model of Neutrino Mass with $\Delta(27)$ Symmetry

Ernest Ma and Alexander Natale

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California, Riverside, California 92521, USA

Abstract

The scotogenic model of radiative neutrino mass with Z_2 or $U(1)_D$ dark matter is shown to accommodate $\Delta(27)$ symmetry naturally. The resulting neutrino mass matrix is identical to either of two forms, one proposed in 2006, the other in 2008. These two structures are studied in the context of present neutrino data, with predictions of CP violation and neutrinoless double beta decay.

To understand the pattern of neutrino mixing, non-Abelian discrete symmetries have been used frequently in the past several years, starting with A_4 [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. Another symmetry $\Delta(27)$ was also studied [7, 8, 9] some years ago. Using the fact that it admits geometric CP violation [10], it has been proposed recently for understanding the CP phases in the mixing of quarks [11, 12] and of leptons [13, 14].

In a parallel development, there is a large body of literature on the radiative generation of neutrino mass through dark matter. The simplest original (scotogenic) one-loop model [15] adds one extra scalar doublet (η^+, η^0) and three neutral fermion singlets $N_{1,2,3}$ together with an exactly conserved Z_2 symmetry under which the new particles are odd and the standard-model (SM) particles are even. The resulting one-loop diagram for Majorana neutrino mass is shown in Fig. 1.



Figure 1: One-loop generation of neutrino mass with Z_2 symmetry.

A variation of this mechanism was recently proposed [16], using two extra scalar doublets $(\eta^+_{1,2}, \eta^0_{1,2})$ transforming as ± 1 under an $U(1)_D$ gauge symmetry together with three Dirac fermion singlets $N_{1,2,3}$ transforming as $+1$. The resulting one-loop diagram for Majorana neutrino mass is shown in Fig. 2.

Combining these two ideas, it is shown in this paper that $\Delta(27)$ is naturally adapted to realize the two neutrino mass matrices proposed earlier [7, 9] without additional particle content in the loop, in either the Z_2 or $U(1)_D$ case. We then study their implications in the



Figure 2: One-loop generation of neutrino mass with $U(1)_D$ symmetry.

context of present neutrino data.

The group $\Delta(27)$ has nine one-dimensional representations $\underline{1}_i (i = 1, ..., 9)$ and two three-dimensional ones $\underline{3}, \underline{3}^*$. Their multiplication rules are

$$\underline{3} \times \underline{3}^* = \sum_{i=1}^{9} \underline{1}_i, \qquad \underline{3} \times \underline{3} = \underline{3}^* + \underline{3}^* + \underline{3}^*. \tag{1}$$

In the decomposition of $\underline{3} \times \underline{3} \times \underline{3}$, there are three invariants: $111 + 222 + 333$ and $123 + 231 + 312 \pm (132 + 213 + 321)$. In Fig. 1, let $\Phi, \eta \sim \underline{1}_1$, $\nu \sim \underline{3}$, $N \sim \underline{3}^*$, then the 3×3 Majorana neutrino mass matrix is proportional to the 3×3 Majorana N mass matrix, which is nonzero from the vacuum expectation values of a neutral scalar $\zeta \sim \underline{3}$ under $\Delta(27)$ with the Yukawa couplings $f_{ijk} N_i N_j \zeta_k^*$. In Fig. 2, let $\Phi, \eta_{1,2} \sim \underline{1}_1$, $\nu \sim \underline{3}$, $N_R \sim \underline{3}$, $N_L \sim \underline{3}^*$, then the same result is obtained with $f_{ijk} \bar{N}_{Li} N_{Rj} \zeta_k$. In both cases, the neutrino mass matrix is of the form

$$\mathcal{M}_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} fa & c & b \\ c & fb & a \\ b & a & fc \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2}$$

where a, b, c are proportional to the three arbitrary vacuum expectation values of ζ.

In Ref. [7], with $l^c \sim \underline{3}^*$ and $\phi_{1,2,3} \sim \underline{1}_{1,2,3}$, the charged-lepton mass matrix is diagonal, whereas in Ref. [9], with $l^c \sim \underline{3}$ and $\phi \sim \underline{3}$, it is given by

$$\mathcal{M}_l = U_\omega \begin{pmatrix} m_e & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_\mu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_\tau \end{pmatrix} U_\omega^\dagger, \tag{3}$$

where U_ω is the familiar

$$U_\omega = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4}$$

with $\omega = \exp(2\pi i/3) = -1/2 + i\sqrt{3}/2$. Both models are consistent with $\theta_{13} \neq 0$, but they were proposed before its determination in 2012.

Consider first the case where the charged-lepton mass matrix is diagonal. In Ref. [7], two solutions were found with $\theta_{13} = 0$; one with $f \simeq 1$, the other with $f \simeq -0.5$. The former turns out to be unacceptable because θ_{13} is always very small. The latter has a solution as shown below. Let $f = -0.5 + \epsilon$, $a = b(1+\eta)$ and $c = b(1-\delta)$, then in the tribimaximal basis, the neutrino mass matrix becomes

$$\mathcal{M}_\nu^{TB} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{3}{2} + \epsilon + \frac{3}{4}\delta & -\frac{(2\eta+\delta)}{2\sqrt{2}} & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}\delta \\ -\frac{(2\eta+\delta)}{2\sqrt{2}} & \frac{3}{2} + \epsilon + \frac{1}{2}\eta - \frac{1}{2}\delta & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{2}}\delta \\ \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}\delta & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{2}}\delta & -\frac{3}{2} + \epsilon - \eta + \frac{1}{4}\delta \end{pmatrix} b, \tag{5}$$

where ϵ, η, δ are all assumed to be small compared to one. We define $\delta + 2\eta = \zeta$ and assume all parameters tio be real, then

$$\Delta m^2_{21} \simeq \frac{3}{4}(8\epsilon + \zeta)b^2, \quad \Delta m^2_{31} \simeq \frac{3}{2}\zeta b^2, \quad \sin\theta_{13} \simeq \pm\frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2}\zeta}, \quad \tan\theta_{12} \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[\frac{1-\zeta/6}{1+\zeta/12}\right]. \tag{6}$$

Using $\tan^2\theta_{12} = 0.45$, we find $\zeta = 0.209$. Hence $\Delta m^2_{31} > 0$, i.e. normal ordering of neutrino masses. Using $\Delta m^2_{31} = 2.32 \times 10^{-3}$ eV^2, we find $b = 0.086$ eV. Using $\sin\theta_{13} = \pm 0.16$, we find $\delta = \pm 0.047$. Using $\Delta m^2_{21} = 7.50 \times 10^{-5}$ eV^2, we find $8\epsilon + \zeta = 0.0135$. This predicts $\sin^2 2\theta_{23} = 0.966$ and $m_{ee} = |fa| = 0.05$ eV for the effective Majorana neutrino mass in neutrinoless double beta decay..

We consider also the case with δ purely imaginary, in which case $\sin^2 2\theta_{23} = 1$ is guaranteed in the limit of a symmetry based on a generalized CP transformation [17]. Using a complete numerical analysis, we plot in Fig. 3 the predictions of this model for m_{ee} as a function of $\sin^2 2\theta_{12}$ for $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} = 0.095 \pm 0.010$. The higher (lower) band corresponds to δ real (purely imaginary), with the allowed region in between for any arbitrary phase.



Figure 3: Predictions of m_{ee} versus $\sin^2 2\theta_{12}$ for $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} = 0.095 \pm 0.010$.

We plot in Fig. 4 the invariant J_{CP} as a function of $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ for δ purely imaginary and $\sin^2 \theta_{12} = 0.857 \pm 0.024$.

Consider next the case where $\mathcal{M}_l$ is given by Eq. (3). In the tribimaximal basis,

$$\mathcal{M}_\nu^{TB} = \begin{pmatrix} a + f(b+c)/2 & (b+c)/\sqrt{2} & f(-b+c)/2 \\ (b+c)/\sqrt{2} & fa & (b-c)/\sqrt{2} \\ f(-b+c)/2 & (b-c)/\sqrt{2} & a - f(b+c)/2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{7}$$

Let $f = -1 + \epsilon'$, $\eta' = (b+c)/2a$, $\delta' = (b-c)/2a$, then

$$\mathcal{M}_\nu^{TB} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1-\eta' & \sqrt{2}\eta' & \sqrt{2}\delta' \\ \sqrt{2}\eta' & -1+\epsilon' & \delta' \\ \sqrt{2}\delta' & \delta' & 1+\eta' \end{pmatrix} a, \tag{8}$$

where $\epsilon', \eta', \delta'$ are all assumed to be small compared with one. This turns out to have the same approximate solution as Eq. (5) with the following substitutions:

$$a = \frac{-3b}{2}, \quad \eta' = \frac{\zeta}{6}, \quad \delta' = \frac{\delta}{2\sqrt{6}}, \quad \epsilon' = \frac{-4\epsilon}{3}. \tag{9}$$

The predicted m_{ee} is also approximately the same. Thus the physical manifestations of this second model are indistinguiable from those of the first to a good approximation.



Figure 4: Predictions of $|J_{CP}|$ versus $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ for δ purely imaginary and $\sin^2 2\theta_{12} = 0.857 \pm 0.024$.

Acknowledgment : This work is supported in part by the U. S. Department of Energy under Grant No. de-sc0008541.

References

[1] E. Ma and G. Rajasekaran, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 113012 (2001).

[2] E. Ma, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A17**, 2361 (2002).

[3] K. S. Babu, E. Ma, and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Lett. **B552**, 207 (2003).

[4] E. Ma, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 031901(R) (2004).

[5] G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, Nucl. Phys. **B720**, 64 (2005).

[6] K. S. Babu and X.-G. He, hep-ph/0507217.

[7] E. Ma, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A21**, 1917 (2006).

[8] I. de Medeiros Varzielas, S. F. King, and G. G. Ross, Phys. Lett. **B648**, 201 (2007).

[9] E. Ma, Phys. Lett. **B660**, 505 (2008).

[10] G. C. Branco, J.-M. Gerard, and W. Grimus, Phys. Lett. **B136**, 383 (1984).

[11] G. Bhattacharyya, I. de Medeiros Varzielas, and P. Leser, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 241603 (2012).

[12] I. de Medeiros Varzielas and D. Pidt, J. Phys. **G41**, 025004 (2014).

[13] E. Ma, Phys. Lett. **B723**, 161 (2013).

[14] I. de Medeiros Varzielas and D. Pidt, JHEP **1311**, 206 (2013).

[15] E. Ma, Phys. Rev. **D73**, 077301 (2006).

[16] E. Ma, I. Picek, and B. Radovcic, Phys. Lett. **B726**, 744 (2013).

[17] W. Grimus and L. Lavoura, Phys. Lett. **B579**, 113 (2004).